

**Online Comment by User: soneill**

**Submitted on:** 10/31/2006 6:17:00 PM

**Comment Category:** Comment on all alternatives

**Comment Location:** Chapter-5, Page-5

**Address:** , , 98007

**Comment:**

**I-0884-001** | This is precisely where the politicians failed. The ENTIRE point of replacing this bridge is nothing more than creating additional, new capacity for vehicles to transit the north end of the lake. The fact that the 8 lane alternative would provide under-utilized capacity is PRECISELY THE GOAL! Anything less than this is not stepping up to the need. Nowhere is it mentioned that the separate I-5 study could provide the necessary relief through an independent mechanism, and at a different point in time, to make advantage and utilize the extra capacity provided by the extra lanes. Likewise, nowhere is it mentioned that the independent I-405 study could provide the same future relief for congestion on it's corridor.

**I-0884-002** | The statement that single occupant vehicles are contrary to regional and local policies encouraging greater use of transit and HOV's is also horribly mis-guided. Such policies were never meant to further the use of mass transit at the cost of single occupant vehicles, but rather to augment the use of single occupant vehicles. The public in Washington State have clearly voted the single occupant vehicle to be the vehicle of choice, as more people in this state use this means of transportation, by far, than all others means combined. This is a clear failure of our politicians to provide for the future capacity needs of our area in a comprehensive manner.

**Comment Category:** Comment on all alternatives

**Comment Location:** Chapter-5, Page-6

**Comment:**

**I-0884-003** | The decision to eliminate the tunnel was the right decision. This option did nothing to add capacity to the bridge, and came at a prohibitive cost.

**Comment Category:** 6-Lane Alternative

**Comment Location:** Chapter-5, Page-6

**Comment:**

**I-0884-004** | The 6-Lane alternative is the only viable alternative, after the 8-lane alternative was eliminated. This is because the only viable reason for replacing this bridge is to add capacity. It would be unthinkable to spend the money to replace this bridge, and not add the capacity required for our current and future traffic needs.

**Comment Category:** 4-Lane Alternative

**Comment Location:** Chapter-5, Page-8

**Comment:**

The 4-lane alternative is worthless, and should have been thrown out first. There is absolutely no point whatsoever in spending the money to rebuild this bridge without addressing the needs of our community for traffic flow improvements.

**I-0884-001**

**Comment Summary:**

8-Lane Alternative

**Response:**

See Section 1.1 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.

**I-0884-002**

**Comment Summary:**

Regional Land Use and Transportation Planning

**Response:**

See Section 6.4 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.

**I-0884-003**

**Comment Summary:**

Tube/Tunnel Concepts

**Response:**

See Section 1.1 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.

**I-0884-004**

**Comment Summary:**

6-Lane Alternative

**Response:**

See Section 1.2 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.